



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

XII.—*The 'Οδυσσῆς of Cratinus and the Cyclops of Euripides*

BY PROFESSOR ROLLIN H. TANNER

ILLINOIS COLLEGE

THE story of Odysseus and his adventure with the Cyclops was not only a favorite with readers of Homer but was also alluring to the writers of the ancient drama, to several of whom it furnished the plot for a play. Preëminent among these plays stands the *Cyclops* of Euripides, much enhanced in value by the fact that it is our only complete example of an important type of the drama, and the 'Οδυσσῆς of Cratinus, of which, unfortunately, we have but a few scattered verses. It is but natural that students of either play should look to the other for help regarding matters of setting and interpretation, and should try if possible to discover whether there is any relation between them, and what that relation is. So far as we know, this question has not as yet received proper consideration. Kaibel¹ has rendered us an important service in his discussion of the relation of the *Cyclops* and the 'Οδυσσῆς to Homer's narrative, and the changes which Euripides and Cratinus each made in the account of this adventure to suit the exigencies of their plays. He has practically nothing to say, however, about the relation between these two plays themselves, apart from the statement (p. 82) that there is general agreement among scholars that the *Cyclops* was composed after the 'Οδυσσῆς, and that he concurs in this opinion. This consensus of opinion, however, regarding their relative dates, is undoubtedly due entirely to the fact that on independent grounds the *Cyclops* has been regarded as one of Euripides' later plays, while the 'Οδυσσῆς is classed among the early productions of Cratinus. Although in matters pertaining to literary style it is well-nigh impossible to secure absolute proof, I think we shall find very good evidence to show that there is a close relation between these two plays which has

¹ *Hermes*, xxx (1895), 71-88.

not hitherto been understood. Their connection, when rightly appreciated, will assist us materially in determining the dates of both.

This relation will be best brought out by a study of the description of Polyphemus' grawsome meal, as it is portrayed in each of these plays and in Homer, their common source. Nothing could excel the perfect and consistent picture of a brutally wild and monstrously savage nature, which Homer gives (*i*, 288–293):

ἀλλ’ ὅ γ’ ἀναίξας ἐτάροις ἐπὶ χεῖρας ἵαλλε,
σὺν δὲ δύῳ μάρψας ὡς τε σκύλακας ποτὶ γαίη
κόπτ’· ἐκ δὲ ἐγκέφαλος χαμάδις ῥέε, δεῦε δὲ γαιαν.
τοὺς δὲ διὰ μελεῖστὶ ταμὼν ὑπλίσσατο δόρπον·
ἥσθιε δὲ ὡς τε λέων ὁρεσίτροφος, οὐδὲ ἀπέλειπεν,
ἔγκατά τε σάρκας τε καὶ ὁστέα μυελόεντα.

In Euripides' *Cyclops* this episode, of course, has to be enacted behind the scenes, and is related by Odysseus, who, after describing the preliminary preparations, says (396–404):

ώς δὲ ἦν ἔτοιμα πάντα τῷ θεοστυγεῖ
“Αἰδου μαγείρω φῶτε συμμάρψα δύο
ἔσφαζέ ἔταιρων τῶν ἐμῶν, βίθμῳ δὲ ἐνὶ²
τὸν μὲν λέβητος ἐς κύτος χαλκήλατον,
τὸν δὲ αὖ, τένοντος ἀρπάσας ἄκρου ποδός,
παίων πρὸς δὲ ὃν στόνυχα πετραίου λίθον,
ἐγκέφαλον ἐξέρρανε, καὶ τὴν πάσαστ
λάβρῳ μαχαίρᾳ σάρκας ἔξωπτα πυρί,
τὰ δὲ ἐς λέβητ’ ἐφῆκεν ἔψεσθαι μελη.

By a careful comparison of these two passages one can easily see that Euripides' account contains practically all the details of Homer's narrative.² The sudden seizure of two of Odysseus' unfortunate companions, the brutal dashing against the cave, the smashing out of their brains, and the devouring of them as part of his meal, are all faithfully reproduced. But Euripides has added a thought not contained in Homer: his Cyclops 'roasts' and 'boils' the flesh of Odysseus' luckless

² The last two lines of the Homeric passage are represented by Euripides a little farther on (409).

comrades.³ This new idea is indicated by the heavy-faced type in the quotation. Homer himself tempted Euripides to make this amplification, for he had supplied the fire ready to hand (251) and often mentions the λέβης,⁴ which was placed on the fire for cooking purposes. Euripides' Cyclops, though wild and cruel, has more of the characteristics of the man—he is ὁ θεοστυγής μάγειρος—while Homer's Cyclops is a veritable λέων ὄρεστροφος. Probably no one will claim that Euripides has improved upon the Homeric delineation of this character.

Fortunately, Athenaeus (ix, 385, *cd*) has preserved for us a passage from the Ὀδυσσῆς (fr. 143 K) which corresponds to this description :

ἀνθ' ὃν πάντας ἐλῶν νῦμᾶς ἐρίηρας ἔταιρος,
φρύξας, ἐψήσας, κάπ' ἀνθρακιᾶς ὄπτήσας
εἰς ἄλμην τε καὶ ὀξέαλμην κατ' ἐς σκοροδάλμην
χλαρὸν ἐμβάπτων, ὃς ἢν ὀπτότατός μοι ἀπάντων
νῦμῶν φαίνηται, κατατρώξομαι, ὥστρατιῶται.

We notice, in the first place, that the tragic scene which Homer so vividly pictures before our eyes, and which Euripides describes as having taken place behind the scenes, is here reduced to a threat. This, however, is required by the fundamental difference in nature between comedy and tragedy. In further comparing these verses with the Homeric account we are struck at once by the great dissimilarity. Cratinus has here broken away from the *Odyssey* completely. Apart from the expression *ἐρίηρας ἔταιρος*, there is not a thought or phrase derived from Homer, or even suggesting Homer, except the idea that the companions of Odysseus are to be devoured. And this divergence is especially remarkable in a play which shows clearly, even in the few fragments preserved, that the poet not only followed Homer very closely

³ Euripides has also, naturally, carried this idea into other passages of his play—into Polyphemus' instructions to the satyrs after he has discovered Odysseus and his companions (241–246), into the closing words of the Cyclops' reply to Odysseus in the ἀγών (342–344), and into the choral odes that follow (356–360 and 372–374). Cf. also 392–395, just before the passage we are studying.

⁴ See Ebeling, *Lex. Hom. s.v. λέβης*.

in most of the details of the plot,⁵ but also employed a great many Homeric words and expressions,⁶ and made use of the heroic meter⁷ in non-choral parts. In each of these three respects he seems to copy Homer far more closely than Euripides does. Cratinus has humorously made of his Polyphe-mus a sort of connoisseur in the delicacies of the table and the art of cooking. That this is not, as in the case of Euripi-des, a thought added by way of elaboration to an account which follows Homer in other respects, as some one might urge because of the fragmentary nature of the play as pre-served to us, is shown by the phrase *ἀνθ' ὄντος*,⁸ which begins our quotation and which must of course refer to some act of the *έρηκτες ἔταιροι* which merited the punishment, and there-fore shows that we have the whole threat from the beginning. What led Cratinus to make such a radical transformation in the character of the Cyclops and the conduct of this feast?

Both Euripides and Cratinus have departed from their Homeric model along the same path. Each has partially

⁵ Of the sixteen fragments cited by Kock as authentic, six of the most impor-tant are clearly dependent upon Homer for both thought and language, as is shown by the following table of sources:

FRAG. OF CRATINUS	SOURCE
135 K	ι, 357-359. Cf. also ι, 196-197 and 208-211.
138 K	ε, 303-305. Cf. also ι, 142-145.
139 K	ε, 315. Cf. also ι, 270-271, and <i>Hymn to Ap.</i> 418.
140 K	ε, 273-277.
141 K	ι, 347, 364.
144 K	ι, 502-505.

A study of these references indicates that Cratinus undoubtedly used the fifth book of the *Odyssey* as his source for the part of the play to which frs. 138, 139, and 140 belong, and the ninth book for the rest. In these six fragments, comprising more than one-third the verses which have come down to us, the only words or expressions which do not obviously come from Homer are *πειθαρχῆ* in fr. 139 and the first verse of fr. 144, of which we shall speak later (p. 179 f.).

⁶ Besides these six fragments which are almost entirely Homeric, the following words and expressions in the other fragments also have the Homeric ring: *Λαέρτα φίλον παῖδα*, 136 K; *ἀλυσκάζοντιν*, 137 K; *πανημέριοι, γάλα λευκόν* and *δαινύμενοι*, 142 K; *λωτόν*, 150 K; and *έρηκτες ἔταιροι*, which we have already mentioned in 143 K.

⁷ Besides this fragment (143 K), cf. also fr. 142 K. Euripides has no hexameters.

⁸ The antecedent of this phrase, or at least a part of it, is undoubtedly pre-served in fr. 142 K, which therefore belongs to the same scene.

civilized the Cyclops through the addition of the art of cooking to his accomplishments. It is extremely improbable that each took this course independently of the other. Which one, then, first developed this idea, and which was the follower? To ask this question with the three passages above quoted before us is to answer it. We have seen how easily and naturally Euripides was led, almost by Homer himself and perhaps even unawares, into this change. But our keen satirist, Cratinus, was quick to see that Euripides had distorted this character, and was equally keen in holding him up to ridicule. In other words, this passage of the Ὀδυσσῆς is nothing more nor less than a parody or caricature of the passage quoted from the *Cyclops*. Although Cratinus, in working out the play as a διασυρμὸς τῆς Ὀδυσσείας τοῦ Ὁμύρου,⁹ has, as we have seen, followed Homer very closely in many passages, in drawing the character of the Cyclops he is interested chiefly in ridiculing Euripides. Hence he abandons Homer and with telling and sarcastic humor he overdraws the picture of ὁ θεοστυγὴς μάγειρος.

The manner in which Cratinus represents the character of the Cyclops reminds us somewhat of the 'cook motif,' which was probably adopted from the Megarians¹⁰ by the Old Comedy, and reached its full development in the Middle and New Comedy. It is, of course, a question as to how fully this motif was developed in the time of Cratinus, and especially in the early part of his career. For we shall find (pp. 204–205) other reasons for believing that the Ὀδυσσῆς belongs to the early period of the poet's activity. Rankin has evidently searched through Greek literature carefully for all possible references to cooks and their activities. Only fourteen of the numerous passages which he cites go back to the time of the Old Comedy. In four of these¹¹ the word μάγειρος refers to a sacrificer or a butcher, rather than to a cook. This is probably the case with one other also (Ar. fr. 138 K). In the reference in the *Cyclops* to the giant as ὁ θεο-

⁹ According to Platonius, π. δια. κωμ. 5 Kaib.

¹⁰ Cf. Rankin, *Rôle of the Mάγειροι in the Life of the Ancient Greeks*, 13–15.

¹¹ Ar. *Eg.* 216, 376, 418; *Pax*, 1017.

στυγής μάγευρος, the word may mean butcher as well as cook.¹² At any rate the passage does not imply the existence of a cook motif in the Attic drama. Three other passages¹³ show that in early times the profession of the *μάγευρος* was well developed in Greece, but have nothing whatever to do with the representation of this character in comedy. In two of these passages, taken from Herodotus, the word may mean butcher or sacrificer. These seem to have been the prevalent meanings in early times. Four other passages,¹⁴ taken from Attic comedies, show nothing more than that at the time these plays were written the profession of the cook was recognized as a distinct and well-developed occupation. From none of them would we be justified in drawing the conclusion that any such thing as a 'cook motif' existed in the Old Comedy. This leaves one passage (*Ar. Ach.* 1015–1017) which, by implication at least, brings out clearly the characteristic traits¹⁵ of the *μάγευρος* as represented in the Middle and New Comedy. It reads: ἥκουσας ὡς μαγευρικῶς | κομψῶς τε καὶ δειπνητικῶς | αὐτῷ διακονεῖται; But in view of the fact that, from all the plays produced before the time of the Middle Comedy, we have extant this one passage only which can be said in any way to imply that there was a cook motif in Old Comedy, probably it would be nearer the truth to say that this passage is one of the first of those which contributed to the formation of the cook motif in Attic comedy. The passage quoted from the *'Οδυσσῆς*, although not sufficient in itself even to warrant the statement that the professional cook had a definite place in Athenian society, may also possibly have contributed to the formation of the cook motif.

Perhaps the strongest evidence for this cook motif in the Old Comedy is a statement of Athenaeus (xiv, 659 *ab*):

ὅτι Μαίσων γέγονεν κωμῳδίας ὑποκριτής Μεγαρεὺς τὸ γένος, ὃς καὶ τὸ προσωπεῖον εὑρε τὸ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ καλούμενον μαίσωνα, ὃς Ἀριστοφάνης φησὶν ὁ Βυζάντιος ἐν τῷ περὶ Προσώπων, εὑρεūν αὐτὸν φάσκων καὶ τὸ τοῦ θεράποντος πρόσωπον καὶ τὸ τοῦ μαγεύρου.

¹² Cf. Rankin, *op. cit.* 56.

¹³ *Batr.* 40; *Her.* IV, 71; VI, 60.

¹⁴ Pherecr. fr. 64 K; Phillylius, fr. 10 K; *Ar. Av.* 1637; *Ran.* 517.

¹⁵ Cf. Rankin, *op. cit.* 73 ff.

But although Maeson is undoubtedly to be assigned to the Dorian comedy, we have no definite information as to the time when he lived, to say nothing of the particular time when he invented *τὸ τοῦ μαγείρου πρόσωπον*. It may have been near the end of the period of the early Dorian comedy. Moreover, we have no information as to the time when Attic comedy became interested in copying this new rôle. The impression which one would certainly gather from a study of the fragments of Attic comedy would be that this character did not receive any very marked development until the time of the Middle Comedy. But, in any event, even if the cook motif were well developed at the time when Cratinus wrote his 'Οδυσσῆς, it could at most only explain the *manner* of his representation of the Cyclops as a *μάγειρος*, *after* he had decided to picture him as such. It could give us no answer to the question, why he chose so to represent him. This was evidently due entirely to his desire to poke fun at Euripides.

The interpretation of this fragment (143 K) of Cratinus as a parody of a passage in the *Cyclops*, clear though it is from what has already been said, will be clearer still in the light which it throws upon the interpretation of the other fragments of the 'Οδυσσῆς, especially if we bear in mind how fond the comic poets were of making fun of the tragic poets, and of Euripides in particular. We shall see that we now have an adequate explanation of the large number of delicacies which are mentioned in the fragments,¹⁶ and one which will account for almost everything which is unhomeric in them. Also in the second verse of the fragment under consideration (143 K) we find a plain parody of a verse in one of the choral odes of the *Cyclops*, where we read (358); *έφθὰ καὶ ὄπτὰ καὶ ἀνθρακῖας ἄπο. . .*¹⁷ Then, too, in this play Euripides has somewhat overworked the *σύγα* idea.¹⁸ Cratinus has also seized upon this failing and we have it parodied at the beginning of fr. 144 K: *σιγάν ννν ἄπας ἔχε σιγάν, | καὶ πάντα λόγον τάχα*

¹⁶ Cf. in addition to the terms found in fr. 143 K, *σικουδὸν μέγιστον σπερματίαν ὠνούμενον* (fr. 136 K), *πνὸν δαινύμενοι, κάμπτιμπλάμενοι πυριάτη* (fr. 142 K), *τέμαχος δρφώ χλιαρὸν* (fr. 147 K), and *δέλφακας μεγάλον* (fr. 148 K).

¹⁷ Cf. also 372–374. ¹⁸ Cf. 82, 94, 426 f., 476, 488, 568, 624, 629, 680 f.

πεύσει. Verse 488 of the *Cyclops*, beginning with *σίγα σίγα*, also illustrates Euripides' habit of repeating words, especially in his choral songs, a habit which was much ridiculed by the comic poets.¹⁹ This may have led Cratinus to use the word *σιγάν* twice in the fragment quoted above.

This explanation thus restores to order what has seemed like a strange mixture of incongruous fragments,²⁰ and establishes beyond dispute the fact that the 'Οδυσσῆς was brought out after, and undoubtedly not long after, the *Cyclops*. If

¹⁹ One readily recalls the famous parody of this habit in Aristophanes' *Frogs*. Cf. 1337, 1351, 1353, 1354, 1355.

²⁰ We have thus far accounted for all the fragments except four. Körte (*Hermes*, XXXIX [1904], 486) assigns fr. 146 K to the parabasis, and probably fr. 145 K belongs to a series of anapaestic dimeters at the close of the parabasis. Fr. 149 K simply shows that somewhere in the play Euripides described the Cyclops as *μονόματον* or *μονόφθαλμον*. Fr. 137 K has usually been regarded as a part of some one's narrative of events which took place in the cave. But Wilamowitz in his translation of the *Cyclops* (*Griech. Trag.* III,² 141) gives a better explanation of the fragment when he says that Odysseus' companions "sich unter die Speisebetten ducken": es war also wohl ein Mahl in hellenischer Weise arrangiert." Cratinus has carried out his ridicule of Euripides even to the point of setting a table on the scene and furnishing it extravagantly with all kinds of delicacies, the numerous references to which are undoubtedly connected mostly with the preparation and consumption of this meal. The fragment in question probably belongs to a search scene after the blinding of Polyphemus. This scene may very likely have been a parody of the corresponding search scene of Euripides' *Cyclops*. The blinded giant is tauntingly directed to search under the table for his missing prey, just as in Euripides' play he is directed to search under a ledge of rock. Cf. *Cyclops*, 680 f., and also the verses immediately following. The fragment further raises an interesting question regarding the composition of the chorus in this play. It must refer to the followers of Odysseus and hence cannot have been spoken by them. Nor is it the speech of Odysseus or of the Cyclops. There must have been some other character or characters in this play. But there seems to be no indication of another actor's rôle. Does it not seem likely that Cratinus as well as Euripides employed a double chorus? We know that the comic chorus regularly consisted of twenty-four persons. Homer (4, 195 f.) assigns to Odysseus but twelve companions in this adventure, just enough for a half-chorus. Who constituted the other half? Are they satyrs as in Euripides? Or are they brother Cyclopes of Polyphemus, as Kaibel (78-80) suggests? Or has Cratinus taken a hint from some passages of the *Cyclops* (e.g. 245, 359) and made this half-chorus consist of a retinue of pages, or waiters—*κρεαθόμοι*—in attendance upon this gourmand-ogre? Are they won over to the side of Odysseus as in the *Cyclops*? These are all interesting questions for speculation, to which the meagreness of our fragments does not permit us to give a definite answer.

we can determine the date of the production of this satyric drama, it will give us a *terminus post quem* for our comedy.

Regarding the date of the *Cyclops* there has been the widest divergence of opinion. Some writers regard it as one of Euripides' earliest plays, while others assert that it is one of his latest. The key to the correct dating, however, has been found by Kaibel, whose arguments are regarded as conclusive by Macurdy.²¹ By a careful and clever comparison of the closing scene of the *Cyclops* (663–709) with that of the *Hecuba* (1035–1295), Kaibel (82–85) has established the priority of the *Cyclops* with arguments, which, though not universally accepted, have not been refuted and probably cannot be. He discovers, first, "in allem Wesentlichen, ja selbst in einer Reihe von Einzelheiten so ähnliche Erfindung und Ausführung . . . dass von einem zufälligen Zusammentreffen nicht die Rede sein kann." This likeness consists in the blinding of Polyphemus and of Polymestor — "beide erleiden für unmenschliche Frevelthat die unmenschliche Strafe" — in the similarity of their outcries from the cave and the room, and the joyous responses of the choruses of satyrs and of Trojan women,²² in the close correspondence between their threats spoken against those whom they imagine to be still in the room,²³ in the futile attempts of each to catch and take vengeance upon their foes,²⁴ in the ill-omened prophecy of each on the authority of a previous oracle,²⁵ in the haughty

²¹ *Chronology of the Plays of Euripides*, 6–8.

²² Cf. *Cy.* 663–665: Κυ. ὄμοι, κατηνθρακώμεθ' δφθαλμοῦ σέλας. | Χο. καλός γ' ὁ παιάν· μέλπε μοι τόνδ', ἀ Κύκλωψ. | Κυ. ὄμοι μάλ', ὡς ὑβρίσμεθ', ὡς δλώλαμεν. with *Hec.* 1035–1037: Πλ. ὄμοι, τυφλούμας φέγγος ὅμμάτων τάλας. | Χο. ἡκούσσατ' ἀνδρὸς Θρηκὸς οἰμωγήν, φίλαι; | Πλ. ὄμοι μάλ' αὐθις, τέκνα, δυστήνου σφαγῆς.

²³ Cf. *Cy.* 666–668: Κυ. ἀλλ' οὕτι μὴ φύγητε τῆσδ' ἔξω πέτρας | χαίροντες, οὐδὲν δύτες· ἐν πέλαισι γάρ | σταθεὶς φάραγγος τάσδ' ἐναρμόνω χέρας, with *Hec.* 1039–1041: Πλ. ἀλλ' οὕτι μὴ φύγητε λαψηρῷ ποδὶ· | βάλλων γάρ οἰκων τῶνδ' ἀναρρήξω μυχούς. | Ιδού, βαρελας χειρὸς ὄμμάται βέλος. This last verse, as Macurdy (7) has observed, according to the best editors really belongs to the chorus and does not correspond in sense to anything in the passage cited from the *Cyclops*, and would better have been omitted by Kaibel, who was too anxious to make the number of lines in the two passages correspond.

²⁴ Cf. *Cy.* 679 and 689 with *Hec.* 1065 f.

²⁵ Cf. *Cy.* 696–700 with *Hec.* 1265–1268.

replies of Odysseus and Hecuba,²⁶ and in the homeward voyage of each of the avengers at the close of the play.²⁷ The nature of these similarities, with several others which Kaibel has not noted,²⁸ clearly proves his first contention that they are not due to accident. He is also right in his second argument, in which he shows that the material for the *Cyclops* was gathered from Homer and from Homer alone, while the last act of the *Hecuba* has no mythological tradition on which to rest. Polymestor is "nichts als eine Schöpfung des Dichters. . . . Folglich kann der Schluss der Hekabe nur eine Entlehnung aus dem Kyklops sein." That this conclusion is correct is also very clearly demonstrated by two sets of corresponding passages not noticed by Kaibel. The word *μυχός* in Polymestor's question (1066): *ποῖ καὶ με φυγὰ πτώσσουσι μυχῶν*, is not nearly so applicable to the hut of Agamemnon as the same word in the corresponding passage of the *Cyclops* (407 f.): *ἄλλοι δ' ὅπως ὅρνιθες ἐν μυχοῖς πέτρας | πτήξαντες εἰχον, αἷμα δ' οὐκ ἐνῆν χροῦ*, is applicable to the cave of the giant. It seems as if Euripides had the picture of the *Cyclops* scene vividly before him as he wrote the final scene of the *Hecuba*. Another question of Polymestor (1071 f.): *πᾶς πόδ' ἐπάξεις | σαρκῶν ὀστέων τ' ἐμπλησθῶ, κ.τ.λ.*, would seem far more appropriate in the mouth of the cannibal Cyclops than in that of the king of Thrace, however cruel. The corresponding expressions in the *Cyclops*²⁹ are natural enough.

In an effort to refute these arguments of Kaibel, Bethe³⁰ asserts that the last act of the *Hecuba* was developed "mit Nothwendigkeit aus der Anlage der Tragödie," and that there is no ground for assuming the principle of imitation at all.

²⁶ Cf. *Cy.* 701 with *Hec.* 1274–1276. ²⁷ Cf. *Cy.* 702 f. with *Hec.* 1289–1295.

²⁸ In each play the blinded victim does not appear on the scene until a few verses after the outcry. Cf. also *Cy.* 672 with *Hec.* 1094, *Cy.* 676 with *Hec.* 1120 f., *Cy.* 687 with *Hec.* 1257, *Cy.* 689 f. with *Hec.* 1054 f., and *Cy.* 694 f. with *Hec.* 1052 f. The blinded Polymestor seems to grope on this side and that (1056–1074) in order to lay his hands upon the Trojan women in very much the same way as the Cyclops gropes (675–686) after Odysseus' comrades.

²⁹ Cf. *Cy.* 243 f., 340 f., 409.

³⁰ *Proleg. z. Gesch. d. Theaters im Altert.*, 2022. Marquart in his recent dissertation, *Die Datierung des Euripideischen Kyklops*, adopts and expands (43–46) this argument of Bethe.

He says that Euripides had to invent the character of Polymestor, because he needed the faithless friend in order to fill full the measure of Hecuba's suffering, and bring on the reversal of circumstances demanded by the development of the tragedy. He asks how these defenseless women could have taken vengeance on Polymestor in any other way than by blinding him with their brooches, and argues further that this act had to take place behind the scenes, that Polymestor had to appear again on the scene, and that it is only natural that the victim should seek vengeance, and that Hecuba should slip away from him. But Bethe has not touched the real point at issue at all. The reason why Euripides invented the character of Polymestor has scarcely anything to do with the argument. It only serves to emphasize the point made by Kaibel that he did not derive this character from Homer, as he did that of Polyphemus. Nor does the question — and I think all will agree that it is at least a question — whether it would be possible for the defenseless women to seek revenge against their oppressor in any other way, have anything to do with our argument either, for it is precisely the fact that Hecuba did so seek her revenge that brought about the similarity in the situation and gave the poet the opportunity to use again some of the incidents and turns of expression which he had used before. And further, we agree with Bethe that this blinding had to take place behind the scenes, that it was necessary that Polymestor should appear again afterwards, that he would naturally seek revenge in his turn, and that the women would naturally flee from him. But it does not follow that the outcries of the two blinded victims would have to be so nearly alike, would each have to begin with a single verse commencing with $\ddot{\alpha}\mu\omega\iota$, would each have to be followed by a one-verse expression of joy from the chorus, and each be continued by a line beginning with $\ddot{\alpha}\mu\omega\iota\ \mu\acute{a}\lambda'$. The fact that Marquart (45) finds a similar double outcry in Sophocles' *Electra*, which evidently imitates a passage in the *Agamemnon*, is hardly sufficient to warrant the conclusion that this type of double outcry was commonplace. The other instances of double outcries which he cites are of a different kind entirely. Nor

does it necessarily follow from Bethe's argument that each victim would have to think his assailants still in the room and begin his outcry against them with *ἀλλ' οὕτι μὴ φύγητε*, nor that the vengeance of each would have to take the form of a prophecy based on an earlier oracle, concerning the consequences of which each assailant would have to express himself as indifferent. Thus Kaibel's argument for believing that the last act of the *Hecuba* imitates the closing scene of the *Cyclops* in several particulars rests, not upon the similar development of the main outlines of the plot, but rather upon a noticeable similarity in the language used and in the development of minor details of the action, in places where we should not expect such similarity, if the principle of imitation were not at work. Marquart (46-47) points to a large number of similarities between the *Cyclops* and the *Helen*, which seem to indicate the working of the principle of imitation, whether conscious or unconscious, and thinks he sees in a verse of the *Cyclops* (285):

θεοῦ τὸ πρᾶγμα· μηδέν' αἰτιῶ βροτῶν,

a reference to the *καινὴ Ἐλένη* as developed in the *Helen*. It may well be that in the *Helen* Euripides has allowed himself to imitate scenes and incidents from the *Cyclops*, although Marquart himself misses the close verbal correspondence which exists between the *Cyclops* and the *Hecuba*. But certainly to read a reference to the *καινὴ Ἐλένη* into the verse cited is not to use the extreme caution in applying this method of criticism which Marquart so strongly recommends.

Kaibel's third contention (85), that there must have been a lapse of considerable time between two dramas which show such striking similarity of composition as the *Cyclops* and the *Hecuba*, is not refuted by the argument of Bethe that the *Iphigenia among the Taurians* and the *Helen* are of analogous composition and composed at about the same time.³¹ For these two plays do not show the amount of similarity of verbal expression and minute detail which we note in the case of the *Cyclops* and *Hecuba*. It is plain, then, that the

³¹ Macurdy (5; 8) dates them "within two years of each other."

Cyclops was written before the *Hecuba*, for which the generally accepted date is 425–424,³² and that it is therefore one of Euripides' earlier plays.

Although, as we have stated above, these arguments of Kaibel have not been refuted, yet several writers, some of them apparently ignoring his arguments, assign a late date to the *Cyclops* for other reasons. These we must now consider. Rumpel³³ has shown that the number of substitutions of tribachs, dactyls, and anapaests in the trimeters of Euripides gradually increases from about one in sixteen verses in his earliest plays to nearly one in every two verses in his latest,³⁴ and that the *Cyclops* employs trimeters that are among

³² Cf. Macurdy, *op. cit.* 40–46. ³³ *Philologus*, XXIV (1866), 407–421.

³⁴ These facts are shown in the following table, made up from the figures given by Rumpel. The plays are arranged in order of increasing frequency of resolutions, and a column is added giving the dates of the plays according to Macurdy (4–5). The dates which are accurately given by ancient scholia and didascalia are starred.

	TOTAL NO. TRIMETERS	RESOLVED FEET	TRIM. WITH TWO OR MORE RESOLUTIONS	RESOLVED FEET PER 100 VERSES	PER CENT TRIM. WITH TWO OR MORE RESOLUTIONS	DATE
Early Period						
<i>Hippolytus</i>	1024	62	2	6.1	0.20	428*
<i>Alcestis</i>	803	53	2	6.6	0.25	438*
<i>Medea</i>	1037	74	3	7.1	0.29	431*
<i>Heraclidae</i>	895	66	2	7.4	0.22	430
Middle Period						
(<i>Rhesus</i>)	687	63	1	9.2	0.15	4th Cent.
<i>Andromache</i>	956	152	5	15.9	0.52	417
<i>Supplices</i>	950	175	10	18.4	1.05	420
<i>Hecuba</i>	917	182	13	19.8	1.42	425–423
<i>Electra</i>	982	205	19	20.9	1.93	413
<i>Heracles</i>	1001	245	18	24.5	1.80	420–418
<i>Ion</i>	1053	262	18	24.9	1.71	416–414
<i>Iph. Taur.</i>	1077	310	29	28.8	2.69	414–413
<i>Troades</i>	757	221	28	29.2	3.70	415*
Late Period						
<i>Phoenissae</i>	1194	412	40	34.5	3.35	410–409
<i>Helen</i>	1266	453	44	35.8	3.48	412*
<i>Cyclops</i>	587	239	28	40.7	4.77	Before <i>Hec.</i> Prob. be- fore <i>Ale.</i>
<i>Iph. Aul.</i>	882	368	52	41.7	5.90	407
<i>Bacchae</i>	927	398	40	42.9	4.31	407
<i>Orestes</i>	1195	577	88	48.3	7.36	408*

the freest of all composed by Euripides. Three plays only have a larger number of resolutions per hundred verses, and but two surpass it in the percentage of verses with two or more resolutions. This fact led Rumpel (408) to place the *Cyclops* "in die letzte lebenszeit des dichters, etwa von 412 an." We must be careful, however, not to draw conclusions too rigorously from data of this kind; for in the *Helen*, produced in 412, the number of resolutions per hundred verses is nearly twice as great as in the *Electra*, which is now generally believed to have been brought out in 413,³⁵ and the *Hecuba*, which corresponds most closely to the *Electra* in this respect, was produced ten or twelve years earlier. Evidently such facts cannot be used with any degree of precision as a basis for chronology.

The real argument against Rumpel's dating, however, is found, as Macurdy (5) says, in the "nature of the satyric drama," which "will account for the large percentage of resolutions in the iambic trimeter, and the combination of several resolved feet in the same line."³⁶ Comedy at all times used its meters far more freely than tragedy in every respect.³⁷ In the iambic trimeters of Aristophanes the number of resolutions per hundred verses ranges from 101.7 in the *Knights* down to 78.3 in the *Thesmophoriazusae*.³⁸ The satyric drama, which in its nature is intermediate between tragedy and comedy, also stands between them in its verse

The figure 362, given by Rumpel, 408 n., as the number of resolved feet in the *Ion* is a printer's error, as can easily be seen by adding the items given on pp. 409-413. Similarly the number of resolutions in the *Helen* should be given as 453. There is also a slight error in the number of resolved feet given in the same note for the *Heracles*. The number of tribrachs given on p. 409 for the *Heracles* should be 98 instead of 99, as can be seen by adding the items. This number, with the 116 dactyls and 31 anapaests, makes a total of 245 resolutions.

³⁵ Cf. Macurdy, 107, 110, and Christ. *Gesch. gr. Lit.*⁶ 368.

³⁶ We cannot, however, follow Macurdy in attaching significance to the fact that "several of the later tragedies go beyond the *Cyclops* in freedom in this respect."

³⁷ Cf. Gleditsch, *Metrik der Griechen u. Römer*³, 141.

³⁸ The following table is made up from the facts given by White, *The Verse of Greek Comedy*, 39-44. The plays are arranged in chronological order. Here

structure,³⁹ and if the *Cyclops* be regarded as one of Euripides' earliest plays, the frequency of its resolutions in trimeter verses will then hold an intermediate place between the frequency of such resolutions in Euripides' earliest plays and that found in the earliest comedies of Aristophanes. Undoubtedly the results would not be materially different if we had the early comedies of Cratinus and his contemporaries with which to make the comparison.⁴⁰

it seems to be impossible to discover any relation between the frequency of resolutions and the dates of the plays.

	TRIMETERS	RESOLUTIONS	NO. PER 100 VERSES
<i>Acharnians</i>	811	708	87.3
<i>Knights</i>	688	700	101.7
<i>Clouds</i>	758	712	94.0
<i>Wasps</i>	752	694	92.3
<i>Peace</i>	695	610	87.8
<i>Birds</i>	925	908	98.2
<i>Lysistrata</i>	711	600	84.4
<i>Thesmophoriazusae</i>	757	593	78.3
<i>Frogs</i>	839	751	89.5
<i>Ecclesiazusae</i>	895	767	85.7
<i>Plutus</i>	1004	921	91.7

³⁹ Cf. Gleditsch, *l.c.*

⁴⁰ Rumpel (*op. cit.*) has given us a detailed account of all the types of resolution, the distribution of the several kinds of substitute feet according to the position in the verse and also according to their division among words, and the various combinations of two or more resolved feet in a verse. All these details have been carefully reviewed by Marquart (22–27) in an attempt to justify a late dating for the *Cyclops* in each particular. In some of these matters the number of instances is too small to justify any conclusion. In all the others the evidence simply shows that the satyric drama has a position intermediate between tragedy and comedy, and Marquart (27) himself admits that “es wäre Torheit zu leugnen, dass der Kyklops metrisch viele der Komödie nahe kommende Eigentümlichkeiten aufweist.” The evidence which he gathers (28–29) from the fragments of the satyric dramas of Aeschylus and Sophocles, as far as such meager evidence can go, is in harmony with this explanation. For each of these poets shows far more freedom in the treatment of the trimeter of his satyric dramas than in that of his tragedies. In view of all these facts we must not press too far the fact noted by Marquart (28) that in the 74 trimeters of the fragments of Euripides' satyric plays, there are only seven resolutions. The number of plays, four only, from which these fragments come is too small. The *Helen* and the *Orestes* both show a larger percentage of resolutions than contemporary tragedies. It is probable that both these plays had the fourth place in a tetralogy and hence possibly the greater freedom of resolution. On this point and also on the impossibility of constructing a chronological table from data of this kind, cf. Zielinski, *Die Gliederung der altattischen Komödie*, 1081.

If now we consider some of the other metrical and structural data which are used as criteria for dating the tragedies of Euripides, we shall find that according to them the *Cyclops* takes a place among his earliest plays. Some of these points of meter, to quote Macurdy (1-2), are "the use of trochaic tetrameters, the revival of which was a phenomenon attending the increasing freedom of the trimeter, the extension of the use of mixed dochmias, and the greater range of variety in the meters employed." In the *Cyclops* there is not a single tetrameter, only two dochmiae all told (657, 661), and but little variety in meter as compared with other plays of Euripides. Some of the structural criteria which can be applied to the *Cyclops*, according to Macurdy (2) again, are "the extended use of monodies and *ἀμοιβαῖα*, the alternate songs of actors," the decreasing "relevancy of the songs sung by the chorus to the situation in which the singers find themselves," the increasing "repetitions of musical words, and the subjection of sense to sound in the lyric portions." In the *Cyclops* there is but one monody, the very short revel song of Polyphemus (503-510), there are no *ἀμοιβαῖα*, every choral song has the most intimate and vital connection with the plot of the play, and the "repetitions of musical words and the subjection of sense to sound in the lyric portions" are not very noticeable. Thus we see that, in all these points, even if the *Cyclops* is to be judged according to the same standards as the other dramas of Euripides, the evidence strongly points to a very early date, and this evidence is to be given all the more weight because of the fact that we are dealing with a form of literature in which great freedom in these regards might well be expected.⁴¹

Some further arguments based upon some other matters of structure and technique are given by Wilamowitz (19-20) as evidence for regarding the play as one of Euripides' later plays. He finds that in the development of the three-actor

⁴¹ In this connection it is interesting to note that the *Alcestis*, which took the place of a satyric drama in 438, is somewhat freer than other early tragedies of Euripides in the percentage of resolved trimeters, the introduction of *ἀμοιβαῖα*, and the repetition of words. Cf. Macurdy, *op. cit.* 10.

scene, especially in the drinking scene (519–589), the *Cyclops* shows a freedom of execution which is very rare in Greek tragedy. He asserts that such freedom of treatment is altogether lacking in Aeschylus and the early plays of Sophocles and Euripides, is not attained in the *Oedipus* and *Hippolytus*, and is reached, if at all, only in the latest plays of Euripides. In harmony with this freedom of technique he finds that in the *Cyclops* the spoken line is often freely divided between two or more actors, and that such freedom in the breaking up of the verse is found only in Euripides' latest plays. It is very true that in both these respects Euripides' later plays show a decided advance over the earlier ones, and also that the *Cyclops* is far advanced in them both. But these differences in matters of "Freiheit," both in the *Cyclops* and in the plays of Euripides known to be late, are not due so much to a development in literary art, as to a relative absence of the general restraint and conservatism which so strongly marks the early tragedy.⁴² Just as we found that, in the freedom of resolution allowed in the trimeter verse, the *Cyclops* occupies an intermediate position between the early tragedies of Euripides and the early comedies of Aristophanes, so we shall also see that this satyric drama is similarly situated with reference to the treatment of the three-actor scene and the breaking up of the spoken lines. This point will be made clear by a brief comparison in these two respects of the *Knights*,⁴³ one of the oldest complete comedies we have, and the *Hecuba*,⁴⁴ the tragedy of Euripides whose date is nearest to that of the *Knights*.

In the *Hecuba* there are two scenes in which we have three speaking persons. In the first episode, after the entrance of

⁴² Dignan (*The Idle Actor in Aeschylus*, 14) has shown that the strong tendency to limit the action to two persons even when three are present on the scene is due to the way in which tragedy was developed and the early importance of the chorus. For a convenient table of all the cases of the idle actor in Sophocles and Euripides, see Dignan, *op. cit.* 32–38.

⁴³ Brought out at the Lenaea, 424. See Arg. *Eg.* II, 4.

⁴⁴ Date 425–424. See p. 185 and n. 32. For a more elaborate discussion of the treatment of the three-actor scenes in the *Hecuba*, than our present purpose demands, see Listmann, *Die Technik d. Dreigesprächs in d. griech. Tragödie*, 51–54.

Odysseus, we have three actors on the scene for the remainder of the episode. In four-fifths of this scene (218–401), although Polyxena is present, Odysseus and Hecuba do all the talking, excepting only the long speech of Polyxena (342–378), elicited by Hecuba's request that she entreat Odysseus to spare her life. The last part of the scene (402–443) is entirely given to a conversation between Polyxena and Hecuba, while Odysseus remains upon the scene without a word to say. The other scene consists of that part of the exodus which follows the entrance of Agamemnon. In this scene (1109–1292), in which Agamemnon acts as judge between Hecuba and her blinded victim, all the lines are spoken by Agamemnon and Polymestor, while Hecuba stands by and says nothing, except that, according to the arrangement of the debate in the trial, she makes a single long speech (1187–1237) in defense of her action, and a little later has an altercation with Polymestor (1255–1279), during which Agamemnon is silent. Surely neither of these scenes can be said to contain a well-sustained and naturally worked out conversation of three persons, and, although, as Listmann (*l.c.*) shows, there is a marked advance over Euripides' earlier plays, in neither of them do those actors, who for a while are silent, find a sufficiently natural employment in the meantime or an adequate motive for remaining on the scene so long without any participation in the conversation.

In the *Knights* we have two very long passages, each consisting of more than two scenes, in which we have three speaking persons on the scene. In the first passage (235–497), which begins with the entrance of the Paphlagonian and extends to the Parabasis, the Sausage-seller starts to flee from the attack of the Paphlagonian but is recalled by Demosthenes. However, before he can speak, the Knights rush in with such a violent attack upon the Paphlagonian as to render any speech on the part of Demosthenes or the Sausage-seller quite impossible for several lines. The fury of this attack is hardly spent when we find lines given to both these characters (280–283). After the short *pnygos*, which is a sharp alteration between the Paphlagonian and the Sausage-seller, the

rest of this passage is taken up with the secondary *agon*, which consists of a naturally arranged and well-developed series of conversations between the Paphlagonian, the Sausage-seller, and Demosthenes,⁴⁵ who plays the part of the *βωμολόχος* in this play. These three persons are all actively engaged in the action of this scene all the time. The other and longer passage (728–1252), which extends from the entrance of Demos to the final driving off of the Paphlagonian, consists of a series of scenes in which we have a conversation between the Paphlagonian, the Sausage-seller, and Demos, which becomes freer and more lively in each succeeding scene, and in each—except that (756–835) in which the debate before Demos takes on a rather more formal character, so that it is natural and proper for Demos as judge to listen and say little—no one of the three speakers remains silent at any time long enough to cause the faintest suspicion that Aristophanes has neglected him and left him “stranded.” We thus find a freedom and naturalness in the manner of treating this kind of dialogue in comedy which far surpasses anything which we have in tragedy⁴⁶ and is only approached in Euripides’ latest plays, after the bars of formality and rigidness have been let down.

With these facts in mind let us examine a little more closely the drinking scene of the *Cyclops*,—an admirable scene, and, as Wilamowitz remarks, “mit bestem Humor und köstlicher Steigerung durchgeführt.” This scene (519–589) starts with a conversation between the Cyclops and Odysseus (519–538) during which Silenus is present without saying a word. Then Polyphemus turns to him for advice with the words, *τί δρῶμεν, ὁ Σιληνέ;* *σοὶ μένειν δοκεῖ;* Here begins a conversation between the Cyclops and Silenus (539–565), and

⁴⁵ Many lines throughout this part of the play which are assigned by Hall and Geldart to the chorus should be given to Demosthenes, as in Leeuwen’s edition, since they are typical remarks of the *βωμολόχος*.

⁴⁶ The statement of Navarre, *Dionysos*, 20: “A proprement parler, il n’y a presque jamais dans le théâtre grec de dialogues à trois, mais une série de dialogues à deux, où l’un des interlocuteurs est remplacé de temps à autre,” holds good for tragedy proper, but cannot be accepted for comedy. How far it applies to the satyric drama will be seen from the following paragraph.

in this conversation Odysseus has no part, except that, in response to Polyphemus' request, $\sigma\nu\delta'$, $\vartheta\xi\acute{e}v'$, $\epsilon\imath\pi\acute{e}\tau\acute{o}\nu\mu\acute{m}'\delta$ $\tau\acute{i}\sigma\epsilon\chi\rho\acute{n}\kappa\lambda\epsilon\acute{e}n$, which afforded the poet the finest opportunity for bringing Odysseus actively into the conversation, he replies with the single verse, $O\acute{n}tiv\cdot\chi\acute{a}ri\acute{v}\delta\acute{e}\tau\acute{i}na\lambda\alpha\beta\acute{a}n\sigma\acute{e}\pi\acute{a}i\acute{n}\acute{e}\sigma\omega$; like a schoolboy who has learned his part and then lapses into silence again. This conversation is terminated by the Cyclops, who turns to Odysseus with the words, $\lambda\acute{a}\beta'$, $\vartheta\xi\acute{e}v'$, $a\acute{u}r\acute{o}s\acute{o}i\acute{v}\acute{o}x\acute{o}os\acute{r}e\muoi\gamma\acute{e}v\acute{o}v\acute{o}$. After this, Silenus takes his turn as a listener for a few lines, until at the end of the scene the Cyclops drags him, loudly protesting, into the cave. Although the rapidity of the action, the shortness of these separate "conversations," and the interruption of the longest one by the line spoken by Odysseus, give this scene the appearance of a three-part dialogue far excelling in its freedom and naturalness either of the three-part scenes of the *Hecuba*, it yet falls considerably short of the extended scenes from the *Knights* which we have discussed.⁴⁷ Thus we see that here again, as we might expect, the satyric drama occupies an intermediate position between tragedy and comedy, and that this comparative freedom in the three-part dialogue is the result of the relatively freer nature of this type of play, rather than of the development of literary technique, and is not at all inconsistent with the assigning of the *Cyclops* to the earliest period of Euripides' activity as a poet.

The same result, as already intimated, is reached in the matter of the dividing of single verses between two or more speakers. In the *Hecuba*, which has 917 iambic trimeters,⁴⁸ there are three such verses,⁴⁹ each divided between two speakers. In the *Cyclops*, which contains only 587 iambic

⁴⁷ During the first episode of the *Cyclops* after the entrance of Polyphemus (203) there are three speaking persons on the scene. A careful survey of this scene shows rather less freedom in the handling of the three-part dialogue than we find in the drinking scene. For a more extended analysis of the three-actor scenes of the *Cyclops* see Listmann, *op. cit.* 63-65. Listmann clearly recognizes that the technique of these scenes is different from that of Euripides' other plays, and that this difference is due to the fact that the satyric drama and the tragedy are different types of dramatic composition.

⁴⁸ According to Rumpel. See p. 185.

⁴⁹ 1127, 1283, 1284.

trimeters,⁴⁸ we find 22 verses⁵⁰ divided between two speakers, and one (682) is even divided into three dialogue parts. In the *Knights*, which has 688 iambic trimeters,⁵¹ there is greater freedom still, for there are 70 trimeters⁵² divided between two speakers, seven others are divided into three dialogue parts,⁵³ and two⁵⁴ even have four such parts each, and in other dialogue metres there are fourteen verses⁵⁵ divided between two speakers, and one (338) into four dialogue parts. Here, too, the *Cyclops* occupies a middle ground between the early tragedy and comedy and we have no argument for placing it among Euripides' latest plays. The same explanation will also account for all the facts brought out by Marquart (30–36) in his detailed examination of this subject.

We can now easily explain why Wilamowitz (20₁) feels that, "die Stichomythie klingt nicht nach der ältesten Zeit," especially considering the fact enunciated by Gleditsch (*op. cit.* 234) that it is usually used only when the dialogue becomes considerably enlivened. We are not to expect the stichomythia of a satyric drama, though of early date, to have the same "ring" as that of the early tragedy. Wilamowitz himself admits "dass die Diktion in manchem altertümlicher scheint" and we do not now need to resort to his explanation "dass der Dichter die rhetorischen Künste hier nicht brauchen kann." Wilamowitz further points with admiration, and rightly so, to some matters of technique in the management of the scenes,—the fact that the repugnant blinding of the giant takes place off the scene, the skilful motivating of the continued presence of the chorus, which was required by the nature of the ancient drama, and the rapid dénouement

⁵⁰ 153, 154, 261, 546, 558, 560, 565, 568, 640, 669, 670, 672, 673, 674, 675, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 689.

⁵¹ According to White. See p. 187.

⁵² 7, 8, 14, 22, 26, 27, 28, 33, 80, 102, 106, 109, 111, 117, 121, 126, 128, 146, 147, 150, 157, 163, 168, 171, 172, 178, 185, 186, 195, 204, 206, 222, 493, 723, 725, 726, 730, 731, 733, 741, 948, 953, 955, 962, 963, 971, 972, 1003, 1005, 1007, 1041, 1048, 1073, 1110, 1151, 1158, 1160, 1183, 1184, 1195, 1198, 1204, 1214, 1218, 1228, 1257, 1336, 1344, 1392, 1395. The last half of verse 1204 undoubtedly belongs to the Sausage-seller.

⁵³ 13, 23, 123, 139, 142, 495, 957.

⁵⁴ 999, 1161.

⁵⁵ 336, 340, 436, 448, 450, 451, 821, 870, 891, 895, 911, 1059, 1069, 1082.

of the plot. But these features of the play need not be taken as indicating a late date. The first is an absolute requirement of the tragedy; as to the last, it may be that the satyric drama was usually shorter than the tragedy and so necessitated a more rapid unfolding, development, and dénouement of the plot. Besides, we must expect some rays of genius even in Euripides' earliest play, and there is always the possibility that in an early work a poet may in some respects reach a height to which he afterwards fails to attain; and yet, as we shall see, the *Cyclops* gives evidence of the poet's immaturity in several ways.

Marquart (18-19) gives a list of some thirty-two words which are found only in the *Cyclops* and in Euripides' later plays, and from this fact argues for a late dating for the *Cyclops*. Many of these words are of a colloquial nature, and, while they would appear naturally enough in the unrestrained language of an early satyric drama, were not used in tragedy until Euripides in his later dramas refused longer to be bound by the older restraints. Others of these words are so rare that they are found in but one or two plays besides the *Cyclops*, and are therefore valueless as evidence for the date of the play. No doubt several words could be found common only to the *Alcestis* and Euripides' later plays, or to the *Bacchae* and Euripides' early plays. The other linguistic facts which he cites (20-22) are of the same kind.

Another argument for assigning a late date to this play is given by Schmid,⁵⁶ who says that Euripides "gibt dem Stück aktuellen Reiz dadurch, dass er dem Kyklopen Züge des karierten sophistischen Übermenschentums beilegt. Schon das weist das Satyrspiel in die spätere Zeit des Dichters, nicht vor 420." This argument he has expressed more fully in another place,⁵⁷ where he asserts that the *ἀγών* between Odysseus and the Cyclops "ist nämlich gewiss nicht ohne Beziehung auf die Sophisten à la Kallikles und Thrasymachos

⁵⁶ In Christ's *Gesch. gr. Lit.*⁶ 376. Of course the "triumph of Greek wit over barbarian stupidity," to which Schmid refers just before the passage quoted, is inherent in the story as it came from Homer.

⁵⁷ *Philologus*, LV (1896), 57 and n.

geschrieben, welche schon dem 5. Jahrhundert die Lehre vom Einzigen und seinem Eigenthum verkündigten.” An instance of this allusion he finds in the opening sentence of the Cyclops’ speech (316–317): ὁ πλοῦτος, ἀνθρωπίσκε, τοῖς σοφοῖς θεός, | τὰ δὲ ἄλλα κόμποι καὶ λόγων εὐμορφίαι, which he asserts is unsuited to his character and the setting of this scene, and can only be explained on the supposition that the poet intended in this way to criticise the contemporary “Kannibalenmoral.” We may be inclined to agree with him in finding “Züge des karikierten sophistischen Übermenschen-tums” in the sentence cited, and in the whole tone of the speech which follows.⁵⁸ But we cannot agree with him in thinking that this gives warrant for assigning a late date to the play, for there is nothing in the sophistical tone of the Cyclops’ speech which could not have been derived from Protagoras, who came to Athens about the middle of the fifth century,⁵⁹ and whose famous doctrine, πάντων χρημάτων μέτρον ἔστιν ἀνθρωπος, τῶν μὲν ὄντων ὡς ἔστι, τῶν δὲ οὐκ ὄντων ὡς οὐκ ἔστι, is quite in harmony with this philosophy. And still further, we must not overlook the fact that there is a very substantial basis for the development of this idea of “Übermenschentum” in Homer (*i.*, 273–278):

νήπιος εἰς, ὁ ξεῖν', ἦ τηλόθεν εἰλήλουθας,
οὐς με θεοὺς κέλεαι ἦ δειδίμεν ἦ ἀλέσθαι·
οὐ γὰρ Κύκλωπες Διὸς αἰγιόχου ἀλέγουσιν
οὐδὲ θεών μακάρων, ἐπεὶ ἦ πολὺ φέρτεροί είμεν.
οὐδὲ ἄν ἐγὼ Διὸς ἔχθος ἀλευάμενος πεφιδούμην
οὔτε σεῦ οὕθ' ἔταρων, εἰ μὴ θυμός με κελεύοι.

Furthermore we find traces of the same “sophistical tone of superiority” in some passages of the *Alcestis*,⁶⁰ which was produced in 438.⁶¹

⁵⁸ Cf. also 231, 521, 523, 525, 527.

⁵⁹ Cf. Christ, *Gesch. gr. Lit.*⁶ 645.

⁶⁰ Cf. 779–780 and 787–789.

⁶¹ Cf. Arg. *Alc.* Some other statistics which Marquart (39–42) discusses either have no bearing on the question at all, or seem, as far as they go, to indicate an early dating. What chronological significance can be attached to the varying percentages of choral verses, when plays as nearly contemporaneous as the *Bacchae* and the *Orestes*, have respectively the highest and the lowest proportion of lyric

We have thus seen that practically all the arguments which have been adduced for a late date of the *Cyclops*, when carefully examined, either point in quite the opposite direction or are entirely without weight. A closer examination of the play itself reveals many signs of immaturity in its author. It has been the almost unanimous opinion of scholars that this play falls considerably below the standard of Euripides' other plays and that undoubtedly we are not so fortunate as to have preserved for us here one of the best specimens of the satyric drama.⁶² In the first part of this discussion⁶³ we have already noticed some of these signs of immaturity in Euripides' delineation of the character of the Cyclops, and in his overdoing of a single idea, and have observed the keenness with which he was satirized for these weaknesses by Cratinus in the 'Οδυσσῆς. Furthermore, Polyphemus somewhat inconsistently betrays a too intimate knowledge of wine and its pleasures for one who has been represented (123–124)⁶⁴ as unacquainted with it, for immediately, at his first entrance (204–205), as soon as he sets eyes upon the revel scene which the Maronian wine has started, he recognizes the working of the wine-god: τί βακχιάζετ; οὐχὶ Διόνυσος τάδε, | οὐ κρόταλα χαλκοῦ τυμπάνων τ' ἀράγματα. Odysseus, immediately after slipping away from the tipsy giant, says (445) of him that ἐπὶ κῶμον ἔρπειν πρὸς καστηνήτους θέλει, and the Cyclops himself expresses (507–510) the same intention almost as

verses, and when plays as far apart chronologically as the *Alcestis* and the *Iphigenia at Aulis* have practically the same proportion? The fact that the second stasimon of the *Cyclops* is introduced by a series of anapaests is at least as good evidence for an early dating as the peculiar constitution of this set of responsion songs is for a late dating. The five cases of shortening of a final long vowel or diphthong before an initial vowel, the fact that the prolog consists of a single monolog, and the non-commatic form of the parodos, all argue for an early dating. Furthermore, in view of the fact that the *Cyclops* is our only complete satyric drama, and in view of the meagreness of our knowledge of the production of the satyric drama, we can scarcely hope to find, with Marquart (52–59), any reliable chronological criteria in the slight indications we have of the scenery and costuming of the *Cyclops*.

⁶² For a convenient summary of the adverse criticism along this line of Nicolai, K. O. Müller, Kaibel, W. Schmid, Wilamowitz, and Masqueray, see Hahne in *Philologus*, LXVI (1907), 36 f.

⁶³ See pp. 174 f., 177, 179 f.

⁶⁴ Cf. also 521 ff.

soon as he comes out of the cave. That this idea, in the mind of Euripides, came from the Cyclops' own head and was not suggested to him, as Hahne (38) supposes, by Silenus, "um dabei gelegentlich einen Schluck Wein zu profitieren," is shown by Silenus' expressed opposition (540) to the *κῶμος*, and his suggestion that he alone was companion enough for the Cyclops in this symposium, by the fact that he had evidently fared famously (432-434) when the wine was first brought out in the cave, by the familiar liberty which characterizes his conduct during the drinking scene, making it unnecessary to assume that he needed any assistance in order to secure his full share of the wine, and also by a remark (537), made by Polyphemus a little later, which implies some past experience in such revels, although, as Schmid⁶⁵ points out, the satyrs think it necessary (492-493) to instruct him in it. Marquart (14) thinks it not unlikely that the wine itself, even though drunk for the first time, inspired this comus-idea. But it would hardly have been strong enough, Maronian though it was, to have given the sober Polyphemus the correct insight into the condition of Silenus and the satyrs at his first glance. Furthermore, the Cyclops appears to be well aware of just what is happening to him as the wine-god gains control of his faculties, and he recognizes (535) his condition without any prompting. His use of the word *oīox̄dōs* a little later in two places (560, 566) and a couple of other remarks of his⁶⁶ also give the impression of past familiarity with the effects of wine. Schmid (59) rightly criticises the introduction of the *κῶμος* motif, which is neither carried out nor suited to the character of the Cyclops. Nor was it needed, as Hahne (38) thinks, to bring the Cyclops out of the cave for the drinking scene which follows. For this purpose Polyphemus' desire for more of *καλὸν τὸ πῶμα δαιτὶ πρὸς καλὴ* would have furnished a sufficient and far more natural motive, and if Odysseus had brought out with him the larger part of the remaining wine, it would have been quite in keeping with his wily character. Of course this *κῶμος* motif gives variety to the plot and in-

⁶⁵ *Philologus*, LV (1896), 59.

⁶⁶ Cf. 554, 568 f.

creases the suspense by making it improbable that the supply of wine, if shared with the other Cyclopes, especially as it is also being somewhat copiously drawn on by Silenus, will hold out until Odysseus' purpose is accomplished. But even this does not justify the poet "wenn er ein an sich sehr unwahrscheinliches Motiv zum Zweck der Variation und Spannung einführte."

Another point of weakness in the plot of the play is the fact that, on account of the dramatic necessity of leaving the cave open, the poet has not left to Odysseus and his comrades a sufficient motive for the blinding of Polyphemus, for as Kaibel (74) says, there was nothing to hinder Odysseus, his companions, and the satyrs from slipping out of the cave while the Cyclops was sleeping. Marquart's objection (13) that no matter how intoxicated the Cyclops was, he might suddenly wake up and make an end of the whole company, especially if so many people attempted to escape, can have no weight when we consider how much greater was the risk incurred by the preparations for the blinding and its execution. In comparison with this latter risk even the carrying away with them of the drunken Silenus seems an easy matter.⁶⁷ Furthermore, Euripides is obliged to make Odysseus and the satyrs take steps to prevent the Cyclops from carrying out his plan to go and join in a revel with his brother giants, that he may be kept there to be blinded, although his going would have afforded the very opportunity they needed for making good their escape. For we cannot accept the explanation of Hahne (39) that the giant expected to take Odysseus and the satyrs along with him. Any plan so important to the action of the play would certainly have been mentioned by Euripides. But he does not even suggest it in any verse, although in at least three places⁶⁸ there was

⁶⁷ Euripides does not enlighten us about the fate of Silenus. After Polyphemus staggers into the cave with Silenus under his arm (586-589) we hear nothing more of him. In the exodus of the play he seems to be entirely forgotten, although it seems to have been understood (431, 466-468) that he was to be rescued with the rest. Perhaps the Maronian wine had overcome Polyphemus' objections to satyr flesh (cf. 220 f.).

⁶⁸ 444-445, 451, 530.

abundant opportunity for doing so, and at the end of the passage where the Cyclops announces his intention to go, he asks Odysseus (510) to hand over the wine skin to him. And besides, if Polyphemus expected to take Odysseus along to prevent his escape, why did he not make some provision for the safe keeping of Odysseus' companions while he was gone? For, according to Euripides (407–408), they were evidently detained in the cave only by their fear of the giant. Masqueray⁶⁹ rightly feels that the failure of Odysseus' companions to follow the example of their leader in slipping away (426–427) from the giant, or even to take advantage of the opportunity to get out of the cave, which was afforded by the drinking scene, is inconceivable. Nor can we assume here, as Schmid (60) and Hahne (39) do, that Euripides has substituted the motive of revenge for Odysseus' companions who had been killed and devoured, because in the passage (426–483) in which Odysseus unfolds to the satyrs his plan to blind the Cyclops, the poet clearly follows Homer in representing it as necessary to their escape, apparently failing to notice that the change in his plot has rendered it unnecessary. For after relating to the satyrs the grecous events which took place in the cave and telling how he had given Polyphemus the wine ἐπεγχέων ἄλλην ἐπ' ἄλλῃ, Odysseus says (426–429),

ἔξελθων δ' ἔγω
σιγῇ, σὲ σῶσαι κἄμ', ἐὰν βούλῃ, θέλω.
ἄλλ' εἴπατ' εἴτε χρῆζετ' εἴτ' οὐ χρῆζετε
φεύγειν ἄμεικτον ἄνδρα κ.τ.λ.,

and a few verses further on (434–435),

σὺ δέ — νεανίας γάρ εἰ —
σώθητι μετ' ἐμοῦ

to which the satyrs reply (437–438),

δ φίλτατ', εὶ γάρ τήνδ' ἴδουμεν ἡμέραν,
Κύκλωπος ἐκφυγόντες ἀνόσιον κάρα.

⁶⁹ *Revue des études anciennes*, IV (1902), 178 f.

These passages clearly show that the one thought in the minds of Odysseus and the satyrs is the possibility of escape. If in Odysseus' next speech (441 f.),

ἄκουε δὴ νῦν ἦν ἔχω τιμωρίαν
θηρὸς πανούργου σῆς τε δουλείας φυγῆν,

the motive of revenge is expressed, we still feel that it is entirely subordinate to the other. At the close of this passage, after explaining how he intends to carry out his plan of blinding the Cyclops, he adds (466–468),

κάπτειτα καὶ σὲ καὶ φίλους γέροντά τε
νεὼς μελαίνης κοῦλον ἐμβῆσας σκάφος
διπλαῖσι κώπαις τῆσδ' ἀποστελῶ χθονός,

thus plainly leaving us with the impression that the deliverance from the Cyclops is the idea which is uppermost in his mind. If, after Odysseus with his companions has reached a place of safety, he shouts back in a revengeful spirit the words (693–695),

δώσειν δ' ἔμελλες ἀνοσίου δαιτὸς δίκας ·
κακῶς γὰρ ἀν Τροίαν γε διεπυρωσάμην
εἰ μή σ' ἔταιρον φόνον ἐτιμωρησάμην,

it does not prove, as Hahne (39) thinks, that this had been the actuating motive of the blinding, but rather shows his hatred of the monster, who had been so heartless in his dealings with him and his companions, and his conviction that he had been justified in the revenge he had taken, just as does the corresponding taunt in the *Odyssey* (ι, 475–479):

Κύκλωψ, οὐκ ἄρ' ἔμελλες ἀνάλκιδος ἀνδρὸς ἔταιρος
ἔδμεναι ἐν σπῆῃ γλαφυρῷ κρατερῆφι βίηφι.
καὶ λίην σέ γ' ἔμελλε κιχήσεσθαι κακὰ ἔργα,
σχέτλι', ἐπεὶ ξείνους οὐκ ἄζεο σῷ ἐνὶ οἴκῳ
ἐσθέμεναι · τῷ σε Ζεὺς τίσατο καὶ θεοὶ ἄλλοι.

It is very plain to be seen that the passage cited from the *Cyclops* is taken directly from that in the *Odyssey*, and is not, therefore, added by the poet to assist in giving a motive for the blinding of Polyphemus.

Kaibel (87 f.) also justly criticises the “so ärmlich gera-

thene Agon zwischen Odysseus und Polyphem." Whatever may be thought of Odysseus' first two arguments, his last (304-307),

ἄλις δὲ Πριάμου γαῖ' ἔχήρωσ' Ἑλλάδα,
πολλῶν νεκρῶν πιῶσα δοριπετῆ φόνον,
ἀλόχους τ' ἀνάνδρους γραῦς τ' ἄπαιδας ὥλεσεν
πολιούς τε πατέρας,

is weak in the extreme and forms an anticlimax. We cannot assume, with Schmid (58), that Polyphemus had any "Philhellenismus" to which this argument might be expected to appeal, nor that either Odysseus or the Greek audience before whom the play was produced, believed that he had. Polyphemus' reply is much better done. And yet the poet had undoubtedly intended (314-315) to display the ability of Odysseus as a *κομψὸς καὶ λαλίστατος* speaker. As a whole, as Kaibel says, this debate does not show the mastery which Euripides displayed in the debate between Admetus and Pheres in the *Alcestis*. For all these reasons we accept the conclusion of Kaibel that this play comes "nur aus der Ungeübtheit des Dichters."

Kaibel (85 f.) has found what he regards as a positive argument for believing that the *Cyclops* was produced before 438. He notes that the description in this satyric drama⁷⁰ of the contrast between Polyphemus' drunken hilarity and the fearful sorrow of Odysseus' companions, and the passage in the *Alcestis*⁷¹ where Admetus' servant is outraged by the

⁷⁰ 423-426:

ἔγώ δ' ἐπεγχέων
δλλην ἐπ' ἀλλη σπλάγχν' θέρμαινον ποτῷ·
ἥδει δὲ παρὰ κλαιούσι συνναύταις ἐμοῖς
δμούσ', ἐπηχεῖ δ' ἄντρον.

⁷¹ 756-764:

ποτῆρα δ' ἐν χειρεσσι κίσσινον λαβών
πίνει μελαίνης μητρὸς εὐζώρον μέθον,
ἴων ἐθέρμην' αὐτὸν ἀμφιβάσα φλόξ
οῖνον· στέφει δὲ κράτα μωρίνης κλάδοις
δμούσ' ὑλακτῶν· δισσὰ δ' ἦν μέλη κλύειν·
δ μὲν γάρ γδε, τῶν ἐν' Ἀδμήτου κακῶν
οὐδὲν προτιμῶν, οἰκέται δ' ἐκλαομεν
δέσποιναν· δμα δ' οὐκ ἐδείκνυμεν ξένψ
τεγγοντες· "Ἀδμητος γάρ ὡδ' ἐφίετο.

rude conduct of Heracles, are called forth by very similar situations, and he cannot believe that after drawing the beautiful and effective picture portrayed in the *Alcestis* the poet could later treat a similar situation in such an indifferent and ineffective manner. Marquart's (10) explanation of the meagreness of the treatment of this contrast in the *Cyclops*, as due to the haste of Odysseus in his anxiety to save his companions, can hardly be accepted in view of the fact that this passage occurs in a long narrative speech of Odysseus comprising 55 verses, in the course of which the hero has ample leisure to describe with the minutest detail the firewood, milk bowls, and spits of the giant. The tone of the whole speech and the rest of the scene does not convey the impression that Euripides felt the need of curtailing the length of his description, dramatic though it is, on account of any haste in the action of the play. Macurdy (8) evidently regards Kaibel's argument as practically conclusive, and undoubtedly we must so accept it, in spite of the objection which Schmid (57) urges in another connection, that we cannot regard it as an established rule that every first-class poet shows a steady increase in ability from his earliest writings up to the time of his greatest achievement, and never allows himself to produce anything, whether comic or serious, which can in any way compare unfavorably with any previous production. For a careful comparison of these two passages reveals the fact that two very suggestive words are found in each. One of these words, *ἀμονσ'*, is identical in form and has the same position in the verse, in each passage. The other, *ἐθέρμανον* — *ἐθέρμην*', occurs in each passage just two verses before. Neither of these words is at all indispensable to the narrative in either quotation. These coincidences can hardly be entirely accidental. The poet must have had one of these passages more or less clearly in mind when he wrote the other. If this is so, we can, of course, have no hesitation in agreeing with Kaibel that the *Cyclops*, with its inferior portrayal of the contrast between keen sorrow and drunken hilarity, must have preceded the *Alcestis*, especially when we consider the many

reasons already advanced for believing that this satyric drama was one of the poet's earliest productions.⁷²

One argument which has been urged against this conclusion must be considered. Hahne (47) points out that a verse of the *Prometheus*, which he says belongs to the revision of this tragedy, is parodied in the *Cyclops*. The utterance of Prometheus as the Oceanids approach (114–116): *ἀ ἀ, | τίς ἄχω, τίς ὁδμὰ προσέπτα μ' ἀφεγγής, | θεόσυτος ἡ βρότειος ἡ κεκραμένη*; he finds “nicht übermäßig poetisch” and thinks that Euripides must have made a hit by putting into the mouth of his Cyclops, after he is assured that a whole vat of milk stands ready for him, the question (218): *μηλειον ἡ βόειον ἡ μεμιγμένον*. As this second production of the *Prometheus* presupposes a “Neueinrichtung der Athenischen Bühne mit Flugmaschine, Seiten-, Ueber- und Unterbau” which according to Bethe occurred in 427, Hahne finds in this a *terminus post quem* for the *Cyclops*. It seems probable that the verse quoted from the *Cyclops* is a parody of the last verse of the passage quoted from the *Prometheus*, but it is by no means settled that there ever was any revision of the *Prometheus*. This is a question on which scholars seem to be very much divided.⁷³ And even though we accept Bethe's hypothesis of a revamping of the *Prometheus*, this does not necessarily prove that the verse in question was not in the

⁷² The query which Patterson (*Cyclops*, xxxv) makes, who, because he finds the *Alcestis* parodied once in the *Acharnians*, and the *Cyclops* often, asks if this could “mean that the *Alcestis* (438) was not so fresh in the mind of Aristophanes at the writing of the *Acharnians* (425) as the *Cyclops*,” need hardly be regarded as a serious argument, and has been fully answered by Macurdy (8 f.).

⁷³ For discussion of the question of the revision of the *Prometheus* see: Bethe, *Proleg. z. Gesch. d. Theaters*, 159 ff.; Wecklein, *Prometheus*, translated by Allen, 25–27; Oberdick, *Woch. kl. Ph.* 1888, 1311; Robert, *Hermes*, XXXI (1896), 561–577; Gulick, “The Attic Prometheus,” *Harvard Stud.* x (1899), 103–114; Wackernagel, “Sprachgeschichtliches zu Äschylos' Prometheus,” *Strassb. Philologenvers.* 1901. See also *Verhandl. d. 46. Vers.* Leipzig, 1902, 65, and *Woch. kl. Ph.* 1901, 1297 f.; Hoppin, “Argos, Io, and the Prometheus of Aeschylus,” *Harvard Stud.* XII (1901), 335 ff.; Wenig, “In welcher Gestalt ist uns Äschylus' Tragödie Προμηθεὺς δεσμώτης erhalten?” *Listy. fil.* 1901, 161–173; 321–342; Weise, *Zur Frage d. Bühnenauflösung d. äschyleischen Prometheus*, Progr. Schleusingen, 1908; Mekler, *Burs. Jahrest.* 1905, 248–251; 1910, 326 f.; MacRae, “The date of the extant *Prometheus* of Aeschylus,” *A.J.P.* XXX (1909), 405–415.

original play, a point which is conclusively made by Mekler⁷⁴ in his criticism of Hahne's article, where he affirms that Bethe's theory of a revision of the *Prometheus*, "hat mit dem Verhältnis der beiden Verse zueinander von Haus aus nichts zu schaffen." Even if the very passage of the *Prometheus* in which the verse in question occurs was revised, it is more than probable that this verse, a good iambic trimeter, was retained from the original. Thus the fact that the verse was parodied in the *Cyclops* cannot be used in any way as evidence of a late date for this satyric drama, but is rather a proof of the genuineness of the verse itself.

Let us now return to the Ὀδυσσῆς of Cratinus. We have already shown (pp. 173–180) that it must have followed soon after the *Cyclops*. As our discussion has led us to believe that this satyric drama is probably Euripides' earliest extant play, we shall also be right in postulating an early date for the Ὀδυσσῆς, undoubtedly not later than the early thirties. With this point firmly fixed in mind, we are now prepared to accept as practically demonstrated the date which Bergk⁷⁵ assigned to this play, and which, of course, could only be regarded as conjectural until supported by other considerations such as we have discussed, which independently assign the play to the same period. His dating is based on two passages of Platonius, (*π. δια. κωμ. 4* Kaib.): *σκοποῦ γὰρ ὄντος τῇ ἀρχαὶ κωμῳδίᾳ τοῦ σκώπτειν δημαγωγοὺς καὶ δικαστὰς καὶ στρατηγούς, παρεὶς ὁ Ἀριστοφάνης τοῦ συνήθως ἀποσκῶφαι διὰ τὸν πολὺν φόβον Αἰολον τὸ δράμα τὸ γραφὲν τοῖς τραγῳδοῖς ὡς κακῶς ἔχον διασύρει. τοιοῦτος οὖν ἐστιν ὁ τῆς μέσης κωμῳδίας τύπος οὗτος ἐστιν ὁ Αἰολοσίκων Ἀριστοφάνους καὶ οἱ Ὀδυσσεῖς Κρατίνου καὶ πλεῖστα τῶν παλαιῶν δραμάτων οὕτε χορικὰ οὕτε παραβάσεις ἔχοντα,*⁷⁶ and (5 Kaib.): *οἱ γοῦν Ὀδυσσεῖς Κρατίνου οὐδενὸς*

⁷⁴ *Burs. Jahresb.* 1910, 326 f.

⁷⁵ *Rel. Com. Att.* 141–144.

⁷⁶ Bergk (141) showed us how we must interpret this last clause when he said, "Haec extrema cavendum est, ne secus interpretetur: neque enim hoc dicit Platonius plerasque antiquae comoediae fabulas et choricas carminibus et parabasi carere, id quod esset absurde mentientis, sed plerasque fabulas antiquae comoediae, quae his cantibus chori et parabasi destitutae sint, eandem speciem referre atque Aristophanis Aeolosiconem et Cratini Ulixes: nihil aliud igitur refert, quam plures etiam huiusmodi fabulas in antiqua comoedia reperiri, id quod verum esse

ἐπιτίμησιν ἔχουσι, διασυρμὸν δὲ τῆς Ὀδυσσείας τοῦ Ομήρου. These statements show that the Ὀδυσσῆς, unlike most of Cratinus' plays, refrains from personal satire of public men, and imply that the reason for this is some legal restriction similar to that which caused Aristophanes to restrain his wonted attacks on public officials, when he wrote his *Αἰολοσκῶν*. We have evidence of just such an enactment in a statement of the scholiast (on Ar. *Ach.* 67) regarding the archon Euthymenes (437/6): Οὗτος ὁ ἄρχων, ἐφ' οὐ κατελύθη τὸ ψήφισμα τὸ περὶ τοῦ μὴ κωμῳδεῖν γραφὲν ἐπὶ Μορυχίδον. Ἰσχυσε δὲ ἐκεῖνόν τε τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν καὶ δύο τοὺς ἔξης ἐπὶ Γλαυκίνου τε καὶ Θεοδώρου, μεθ' οὓς ἐπ' Εὐθυμένους κατελύθη. There can now be no doubt that the Ὀδυσσῆς was performed in one of the three years (439, 438, 437)⁷⁷ during which this law was in force. Kaibel's (82) objection that "wenn das κωμῳδεῖν verboten war, konnten überhaupt keine Komödien aufgeführt werden" is completely refuted, as Bergk (142 f.) had previously noted, by a Roman fragment of a record of Athenian comic didascaliae,⁷⁸ in which we have two lines, (4) εἰπὶ Θεοδώρου Σατύροις and (13) ἐπὶ Μορυχίδου, which though fragmentary prove conclusively that in two of these years (437 and 439) plays were performed at Athens. The ψήφισμα τὸ περὶ τοῦ μὴ κωμῳδεῖν was undoubtedly a provision against lampooning public officials, similar to the later law recorded by Platonius.

Let us now apply the results we have thus far reached to the dating of the *Cyclops*. Inasmuch as tragedy was not introduced into the Lenaean festival⁷⁹ until after the time when the plays in question must have been produced, this

satis superque docent comicorum reliquiae." See also Leo, *Quaes. Ar.* 14 ff. That this clause cannot refer to the Ὀδυσσῆς, is clearly shown, as Kaibel (75) has pointed out, by the fact that we have fragments preserved (cf. frs. 137 K and 144 K) which the chorus must have spoken and also some (cf. frs. 145 K and 146 K) from the parabasis. Cf. p. 180₂₀.

⁷⁷ It is plain from the passage quoted that the law was not in force in the spring of 436.

⁷⁸ *I.G.* XIV, 1097. For interpretation of the Roman didascalic fragments see Capps, *Class. Phil.* I (1906), 201–220.

⁷⁹ Cf. Reisch, *Zeit. öst. Gym.* LVIII (1907), 308.

satyric drama was brought out at the City Dionysia. The latest possible date for the Ὀδυσσῆς, as we have seen, is 437. As the *Cyclops* could not have been produced in that same year, nor the year before, in which we know the *Alcestis* was produced and took the place of a satyric drama,⁸⁰ the spring of 439 is the latest possible date for its production. Schmid⁸¹ finds a parody of a verse of the *Antigone* in the *Cyclops*. In Antigone's farewell antiphony with the chorus, feeling that she is misunderstood and even taunted by the Theban elders, she gives expression to her feelings in a passionate strophe beginning (838) with the words *οἴμοι γελῶμαι*. These same two words are given to Polyphemus in the *Cyclops* (687) after he has been mockingly directed by the chorus to search on this side and that for his assailants, who are no longer within his reach. The use of this same expression by both Sophocles and Euripides may have been merely accidental, but if Schmid is right in citing the passage from the *Cyclops* as a parody of that from the *Antigone*, the production of the *Cyclops* must have followed that of the *Antigone*, which was brought out either in 442 or 441.⁸² The earliest possible date for the production of the *Cyclops* would then be 441. However, acceptance of this *terminus post quem* must be withheld until stronger evidence can be discovered. The *Cyclops* may have been produced much earlier.

⁸⁰ Cf. Arg. *Alc.*

⁸¹ Christ, *Gesch. gr. Lit.*⁶ 3764.

⁸² Cf. *ib.* 3274.